

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,469		11/14/2003	Timothy M. Londergan	14414-012001	9141
26191	7590	08/25/2005		EXAM	INER
FISH & RIG	CHARDS	SON P.C.		TRUONG, DUC	
PO BOX 102		55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				1711	
				DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/713,469	LONDERGAN, TIMOTHY M.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Duc Truong	1711				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 Au	<u>ıgust 2005</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims		•				
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1 -40 is/are pending in the application						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>17-40</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 17-40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,5-7 and 9-24; claims 1,5-7 and 9-27 of copending Application No. 10/714,266; 10/714,837, respectively, which are allowed. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The only difference is the instant claims is a composition made by a process whereas the claims of 10/714,266 is a process for producing said composition and the claims of 10/714,837 is a composition only.

However, the composition and the steps of the processes in the applications are the same. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the claims of the references within the limitation of the instant claims to get the claimed composition of the same formula since they have been shown to be effective in

a similar system and thus would have been expected to provide adequate results. There is no showing of unexpected results derived from said use.

Page 3

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 17-40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 and 40 of copending Application No. 10/714,387 Although the conflicting claims are not identical. they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference is the instant claim 17 is the combination of claims 1 and 3-5 of the reference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine claims 1 and 3-5 of the reference to get the instant claim 17 in the absence of a showing of unexpected results derived from said combination.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-1081. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/713,469

Art Unit: 1711

Page 4

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DUCTRUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER